

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 14 1996

From: Larry Winward <lwinward@thecore.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/13/96 11:36pm
Subject: Internet Phone Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

As an Amateur Radio Operator and Bell Atlantic employee I can appreciate the fun of experimentation with Internet Telephony. I want to express my concerns as an individual user of the Internet and a taxpayer though.

1. Is the Internet really ready for full scale commercialization of long distance telephone service?
2. What happens to lost tax revenues?
3. Is there sufficient bandwidth?
4. Fair competition and access?

I am not looking for answers, only providing the Commission some food for thought.

Sincerely,

Lawrence W. Winward
-- Larry Winward (e-mail: lwinward@thecore.com)
141 Lauren Lane
Lakehurst, NJ 08733-3301 USA
Telephone: 908-657-4340
Amateur Radio Call sign - N2IFP

CC: Rick Winward <rwinward@thecore.com>

1
10/1/96

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: <kjk@westworld.com>
To: A4.A4(sseal)
Date: 5/14/96 2:12pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

MAY 14 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Kenneth J. Koerner (kjk@westworld.com) writes:

Dear Chairman Hundt,

Consider this an opportunity for a citizen to say thank you to you and the commission you head in your efforts to maintain the difficult balance essential to insuring all Americans are served and represented in the turbulent explosion of communication possibilities. I comprehend the difficulties such an undertaking represents.

Consider also, this is my thoughtful "vote" on the matter before your staff related to the use of telephony software to allow voice-conversations to take place between users via the Internet. While it is most certainly true there is a gigantic investment in place on the part of those companies which currently dominate the telephone systems; it is equally true there burden is no more unique than any other enterprise faces as new technology replaces previous technology. The American citizen should not be made to bear even one cent in additional costs for telephone service due pre-existing capital investments no longer looking like the "slam dunk" investors once imagined. If I can call England as a "local" call due my access to the Internet and the appropriate software, why then should it be my financial burden to concern myself with its impact on MCI, ATT or any other traditional entity? When the average citizen loses their job due to advances in technology, the Federal government does not make it their business to offer them "protected status" and income from their prior employer. The playing field must be level. The voices of the majority view will continue to grow in volume thanks to the door to access which has been opened. Such doors are never closed again nor should they be.

You have the opportunity before you to recognize this challenge must be met with courage despite the potential economic downside to those heavily invested in existing technology. Let's not loose sight of the fact of why we have elected officials and regulatory agencies. It is to insure we maintain a governing body which is "of the people, by the people and for the people." No where in our great constitution does it say anything about protectionist measures for industrial capitalists. Thank you for your kind attention. I look forward to your serving our nation in the best interests of all, even those without a well funded PAC.

Sincerely yours,
Kenneth J. Koerner
Los Angeles, California

P.S. This "screen/letter" format doesn't easily allow for review. Please excuse any breaches of syntax or possible spelling errors.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: max4.83.max-gate.westworld.com
Remote IP address: 205.230.59.183

1
10/17/96 10:00 AM
10/17/96

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY 14 1996

From: Colin MacLeod Simpson <colin.simpson@resonet.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/14/96 12:18pm
Subject: RM No. 8775

this is the begining of a global paradigm shift.

telephones are obsolete.

Colin MacLeod Simpson
ISBN 0-07-057600-9
ISBN 0-07-057601-7

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY 14 1996

From: uid no body <nobody@huka.dc.id1.com>
To: A16.A16(KIDSTV)
Date: 5/14/96 12:23pm

Congress and the Federal Communications Commission are secretly promoting a sweetheart deal with television broadcasters to double the amount of public airwaves the broadcasters currently own.

The wealthy broadcasters will receive this huge giveaway of taxpayer-owned airwaves without paying a cent. A gift valued between \$10 billion and \$100 billion.

As we slash the budget in all areas, can we really afford such a large amount of corporate welfare?

Should such a large amount of broadcast capacity be given to one industry to support 1950s technological solutions in this digital age?

Do the television broadcasters deserve to be rewarded for news coverage that the head of NBC News said chooses "the story that makes you feel repulsion over the story that makes you think"? The executive then asked, "Are we all just whores in search of another share point?"

Recently, telecommunications companies competed in auctions for access to the public airwaves. These lucrative auctions raised \$8 billion for the U.S. Treasury. Why shouldn't the broadcasters also be asked to compete?

Since we have failed to apply antitrust to concentrated broadcasters, how about some broadcast space for public use?

Sincerely,

Robert Vogel
49 Webster Rd.
East Lyme, Ct. 06333

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY 14 1996

From: <dm@netgate.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/13/96 9:55pm
Subject: Petition notice

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I would like to comment in reference to RM No. 8775 that people should have the right to use any type of communication route they want. With the high cost of phone calls these days I think it's only fair for people to use other avenues of communication. If the telephone companies were fairer with there prices than they would not have to worry as much about web phones.

Now the people have another way of being able to communicate long distance with out outrageous high costs. Well I don't think people are going to stand for it and there really is no way the phone companies should be able to regulate this since the internet is a free route and should remain that way.

Therefore I have to say that it would be a mistake to try and regulate internet phones especially when everyone knows why the phone companies want to do it.

sincerely

Dean

[Handwritten signature]

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: WDTV <wdtv@wdtv.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/14/96 4:23am
Subject: Internet Phone

MAY 14 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Gentlepersons: Reference RM No. 8775 please. This is an "informal" comment.

As a sometime user of a program called AmiPhone, because it runs on an Amiga, I would like to object strenuously to *any* attempts by the *very* common carriers who carry 99% of the internet traffic, in their efforts to restrict the useage of that same transmission medium to "non-voice related" digital activities.

I view this as being a bit of deja-vu of the old camel nose in the tent story. The next thing you know, sending a digitized picture by any encodeing means will also be the target of such restrictions, such thoughts based on the fact that they (the phone companies) also are in the business of providing video services to the broadcast industry, something they would like to have a government enforced monopoly on also. The reality of readily available satellite feeds for cross country use, and locally owned microwave links for stl use, amply demonstrate that their tariff structures aren't just "what the traffic will bear", but are in fact totally outrageous.

Open competition in the marketplace, has always resulted in the survival of the fittest, and the healthiest marketplace on the face of the earth. Lets not muck it up, thereby encouraging the further proliferation of the legal leeches that thrive on such often un-enforceable in the real world regulations.

Gene Heskett
<gene_heskett@wvlink.mpl.com>

Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

DA 96-414 Report No. CC 96-10 COMMON CARRIER ACTION

March 25, 1996

COMMON CARRIER BUREAU CLARIFIES AND EXTENDS REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON ACTA
PETITION RELATING TO "INTERNET PHONE" SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE - RM No. 8775

Comments Due: May 8, 1996

Replies Due: June 8, 1996

On March 4, 1996, America's Carriers Telecommunication Association (ACTA) filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling, Special Relief, and Institution of a Rulemaking relating to the provision of interstate and international interexchange telecommunications service via the "Internet" by non-tariffed, uncertified entities. ACTA alleges that providers of "Internet phone" software and hardware are operating as uncertified and unregulated common carriers, in contravention of FCC rules, and seeks three forms of relief.

First, ACTA seeks a declaratory ruling establishing the Commission's authority over interstate and international telecommunications services using the Internet. Second, ACTA asks the Commission for special relief: to order named and unnamed respondents immediately to stop provisioning Internet phone software and hardware without complying with the regulatory requirements of the Communications Act of 1934. Finally, ACTA urges the Commission to initiate a rulemaking proceeding to consider rules governing the use of the Internet for the provision of telecommunications services.

On March 8, 1996, a public notice was issued seeking comment on ACTA's petition for rulemaking. When petitions for rulemaking are filed with the Commission, a public notice is routinely issued shortly after the petition is filed. The Commission's goal in seeking comment is to develop a record on which to base a decision about whether or not the issues raised by the outside party merit consideration.

We hereby establish a consolidated pleading cycle for all of ACTA's requests. This proceeding will be treated as

1

non-restricted for purposes of the Commission's ex parte rules. See generally 47 C.F.R. 1.1200-1.1216.

Because of the complex issues implicated by the ACTA petition, the deadlines for filing comments on the petition are hereby extended. All comments on ACTA's petition should be filed on or before May 8, 1996, and all reply comments should be filed on or before June 8, 1996. Commenters should file an original and four copies of their comments with the

Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, Washington, D.C. 20554.

A copy should also be sent to Wanda Harris, Common Carrier Bureau, FCC, Room 518, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554, and to the Commission's contractor for public service records duplication:

ITS, Inc., 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Informal comments in this proceeding may also be filed via electronic mail to <rm8775@fcc.gov>. All filings in this non-docketed proceeding should reference RM No. 8775.

The full text of the petition, and the comments and reply comments will be available for inspection and duplication during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center.

Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 239, Washington, D.C. 20554. Copies may also be obtained from

International Transcription Service, Inc. (ITS, Inc.), 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037 (202/857-3800). This public notice and additional information on filing comments will be available on the Internet through the "recent actions" section of the Common Carrier Bureau home page at <<http://www.fcc.gov/ccb.html>>

For further information, contact Kevin Werbach, 202/418-1597 of the Common Carrier Bureau.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A response to :

Report No. CC 96-10 COMMON CARRIER ACTION

March 25, 1996 COMMON CARRIER BUREAU CLARIFIES AND EXTENDS REQUEST FOR COMMENT ON ACTA PETITION RELATING TO "INTERNET PHONE" SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE - RM No. 8775

in order to promote electronic commerce by facilitating the use of Internet phone, Web talk or Cuseeme like software, and for other purposes, we the undersigned declare the above action to be an infringement on UNITED STATES citizens ability to use the Information Super Highway.

In that:

- (1) The ability to digitize information makes carrying out tremendous amounts of commerce and personal communication electronically possible.
- (2) Miniaturization, distributed computing, and reduced transmission costs make communication via electronic networks a reality.
- (3) The explosive growth in the Internet and other computer networks reflects the potential growth of electronic commerce and personal communication.
- (4) The Internet and the global information infrastructure have the potential to revolutionize the way individuals and businesses conduct business.
- (5) United States computer, computer software and hardware, communications and electronics business are

leading the world technology revolution as those businesses have developed and are prepared to offer immediately to computer users worldwide a variety of communications and computers hardware and computer software that provide audio and video service.

(6) United States businesses seek to market the products described in paragraph (5) in competition with scores of foreign businesses in many countries that offer similar, and frequently better products and programs.

(7) UNITED STATES businesses have been discouraged from further developing and marketing products with phone or video phone services because of regulatory efforts by large corporate communications organizations, acting through the Federal Communications Commission.

(8) The Federal Communication Commission is ignoring the fact that-

(A) there is no demonstrated public demand for features which give phone companies exclusive access to international communications and

(B) numerous alternatives are available commercially from foreign suppliers and free of charge from the Internet.

(C) the communications act of 1934 is outdated and in need of modification due to technological advances in international communications

(9) In order to promote electronic commerce in the twenty-first century to realize the full potential of the Internet and other computer networks-

(A) United States businesses should be encouraged to develop and market products and programs offering phone and video phone services; and

(B) the Federal Government should be prohibited from promulgating regulations and adopting policies that discourage the use and sale of communications technology.

(10) Should rules be enacted to restrict Internet communications, laws will be required to prevent Government Agencies from enacting regulations detrimental to public interests.